

~~SECRET~~

Subject: MASHNIN Nikolai Vasylovych []

Source: ~~I.M.~~ *Accessary/58*

Date: 28 Mar 1966

DECLASSIFIED AND RELEASED BY
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
SOURCE METHOD EXEMPTION 3B2B
NAZI WAR CRIMES DISCLOSURE ACT
DATE 2007

1. Source continued to maintain social contacts with Subject on the previous basis ; inviting Subject and his colleagues (MIKHALEV Aleksandr and ODABASYAN Boris) to his house , supplying ^{him} with Ukrainian, Russian, and English books and papers, helping in study material aso. Their relations could be described as very friendly , in Source's opinion, ~~ing~~ to the fact that he stuck to his original line in dealing with Subject ,namely,little politica and more socials. Non the less political topics were unavoidable and cropped up quite often withinh the contexts of general discussions.

2. Thus, Subject did not approve of Siniavsky and Daniel trial and in his opinion 'the whole approach of authorities was wrong. This will only complicate authorities' relations with young intelligentsia and young people in general. Subject knew about protests of some ^{Soviet} scholars and writers against the harsh treatment of Siniavsky and Daniel and told Source that also some Soviet lawyers either already have had or will have presented similar petition on behalf of both writers to the CC CPSU. He did not ^{know} the details but added that he did not exclude the possibility that after the Congress of the party the sentences might be commuted to more lenient punishments.

3. Subject denied that there would be a return to Stalinism in the aftermath of the 23rd Congress. In his opinion Stalin would get only a fairer appraisal in the history of the party and the system will get rid of Khrushchevian "tricks and gimmicks" that often had compromised the party and the government. Should it turn out ,however, to be different , Subject would strongly disapprove of it. "Stalinism belong to the past and could not be revived". On the other hand when reminded of Siniavsky and Daniel ,Subject either preferred to keep silent or refer to the protests inside the Soviet Union ~~gainst~~ the harsh treatment of both writers.

~~SECRET~~

SECRET

-2-

In Source's opinion this attitude of Subject could be quite genuine and he was sincere in his dislike of Stalin. Even if, this rejection of Stalinism was more engendered by his wishful thinking not to see it return again than by cold evaluation of ~~fact~~ recent events.

4. Subject obviously gets some briefing from someone "above him" judging by the fact that he often returns to same topic next day or a few days after it was mentioned by him primarily. Thus, in case of the arson of National Library in Kiev, Subject "knew" much more about ~~it~~ a few days later and returned to the topic himself. He does, ~~the~~ same ~~only~~ with topics on international politics as well.

5. Lately Subject was very busy with Prof NEDBAYLO Petro of Kiev who took him to various places and individuals as interpreter under the pretext that he "was introducing and training him". Subject complained about NEDBAYLO as "being an egoist even here and bothering him with his own affairs". Among other things, Prof. NEDBAYLO asked Subject to provide him ^{with} all kind of material incl. Suchasnist # 6 in which there was an article by Dr Prokop on amalgamation of nations in the Soviet Union. According to Subject Prof NEDBAYLO was reading practically everything published abroad in Ukrainian ^{and Russian} that was given to Subject by Source. NEDBAYLO found those publication on Subject's shelves and was very interested in them.

SECRET